



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/659,792

09/11/2003

Eli Abir

101205.55175C6

5628

23911 7590 03/27/2008
CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

NEWAY, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/27/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/659,792	Applicant(s) ABIR, ELI	
	Examiner Samuel G. Neway	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-236 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-29 and 60-236 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 57-59 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 45-56 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/03/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is responsive to the Response to Election/Restriction filed on 13 March 2008.
2. Claims 30 – 59 have been elected and are considered below.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election of 30 – 59 in the reply filed on 13 March 2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 1 – 29 and 60 – 236 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 30, 34, 38, 42, 45, 49, 53, and 57, are objected to because of the following informalities: in the "analyzing said corpus of documents for word strings expressed in said second language" steps recited in the claims, it is believed the limitation "a user defined minimum number of words expressed in a first language" (emphasis added) should be 'a user defined minimum number of words expressed in the first language'.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 30, 32 – 34, 36 – 38, and 40 – 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grefenstette (“The World Wide Web as a Resource for Example-Based Machine Translation Tasks”, Proceedings of Translating and the Computer 21 Conference, London, UK, Nov. 1999).

Claim 30:

Grefenstette discloses a method for creating a knowledge base of associated ideas comprising the steps of:

providing a translation of words expressed in a first language to words and/or word strings expressed in a second language (“Oxford-Hachette French-English dictionary”, page 2, paragraph 2);

providing a corpus of documents expressed in said second language (“World Wide Web can be considered as extremely large corpus”, page 1, Introduction, paragraph 2);

receiving a query to be analyzed, wherein said query is expressed in said first language, and wherein said query consists of a word string (“French noun phrase *groupe de travail*”, page 2, paragraph 2);

identifying for said query, all translations of each word comprising said word string query, to said second language utilizing said provided translation (“the French word *groupe* can be translated by the English words *cluster*, *group*, *grouping*, *concern* and *collective*”, page 2, paragraph 2);

analyzing said corpus of documents for word strings expressed in said second language (“AltaVista search portal allows the Web browser user to search ...”, page 3, paragraph 1), wherein said analysis only identifies word strings having a user defined maximum number of words (page 3, Table 2 and related text. Note that in this case the maximum number is two since all word strings searched are composed of two words), and wherein said analysis only identifies word strings having translations obtained from a user defined minimum number of words expressed in a first language in said identifying step (“French noun phrase *groupe de travail*... ”, page 2, paragraph 2. Note the minimum number is two since the word strings corresponding to the French words *groupe* and *travail* are identified), wherein said analyzing only counts one translation for each of said words expressed in a first language (“Combining the possible translations ... into all twenty-one possible noun phrases”, page 3, paragraph 1); and

returning a list of said word strings expressed in said second language from said analysis of said corpus of documents as word string results (page 3, Table 2 and related text).

Claim 32:

Grefenstette discloses the method of claim 30 where a word expressed in a first language includes certain word strings in a first language such as idioms and collocations (“French noun phrase *groupe de travail*”, page 2, paragraph 2).

Claim 33:

Grefenstette discloses the method of claim 30 further comprising: ranking said list of word string results based on user-defined criteria (page 3, Table 2 and related text).

Claims 34, 36, and 37:

Claims 34, 36, and 37 are similar in scope and content to claims 30, 32, and 33 respectively and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claims 38, 40, and 41:

Claims 38, 40, and 41 are similar in scope and content to claims 30, 32, and 33 respectively and are rejected with the same rationale.

Claim 42:

Grefenstette discloses a method to tokenize associations for the efficient transfer of information, comprising the following steps:

creating an association (“Combining the possible translations ... into all twenty-one possible noun phrases”, page 3, paragraph 1); and tokenizing said association by designating a token to be equal to said association (“placing their query in double-quotes”, page 3, paragraph 1); wherein creating an association includes, providing a translation of words expressed in a first language to words and/or word strings

expressed in a second language (“Oxford-Hachette French-English dictionary”, page 2, paragraph 2);

providing a corpus of documents expressed in said second language (“World Wide Web can be considered as extremely large corpus”, page 1, Introduction, paragraph 2);

receiving a query to be analyzed, wherein said query is expressed in said first language, and wherein said query consists of a word string (“French noun phrase *groupe de travail*”, page 2, paragraph 2);

identifying for said query, all translations of each word comprising said word string query, to said second language utilizing said provided translation (“the French word *groupe* can be translated by the English words *cluster*, *group*, *grouping*, *concern* and *collective*”, page 2, paragraph 2);

analyzing said corpus of documents for word strings expressed in said second language (“AltaVista search portal allows the Web browser user to search ...”, page 3, paragraph 1), wherein said analysis only identifies word strings having a user defined maximum number of words (page 3, Table 2 and related text. Note that in this case the maximum number is two since all word strings searched are composed of two words), and wherein said analysis only identifies word strings having translations obtained from a user defined minimum number of words expressed in a first language in said identifying step (“French noun phrase *groupe de travail*...”, page 2, paragraph 2. Note the minimum number is two since the word strings corresponding to the French words *groupe* and *travail* are identified), wherein said analyzing only counts one translation for

Art Unit: 2626

each of said words expressed in a first language (“Combining the possible translations ... into all twenty-one possible noun phrases”, page 3, paragraph 1); and

returning a list of said word strings expressed in said second language from said analysis of said corpus of documents as word string results (page 3, Table 2 and related text).

Claim 43:

Grefenstette discloses the method of claim 42, further comprising: transmitting said token from one location to a second location or a plurality of second locations; analyzing, at said second location or plurality of second locations, said designated token to identify said association; and providing said association to a user (“submitting these phrases to this Web browser ...”, page 3, paragraph 1, see also Table 2 and related text).

Claim 44:

Grefenstette discloses the method of claim 42, wherein a word expressed in a first language includes word strings in a first language such as idioms and collocations (“French noun phrase *groupe de travail*”, page 2, paragraph 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 31, 35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grefenstette ("The World Wide Web as a Resource for Example-Based Machine Translation Tasks", Proceedings of Translating and the Computer 21 Conference, London, UK, Nov. 1999) in view of Tominaga (USPN 5,311,429).

Claim 31:

Grefenstette discloses the method of claim 30, wherein said word strings expressed in said second language have at least a first portion and a second portion, and wherein said list represents associations of said query in said first language to expressions in said second language, but Grefenstette does not explicitly disclose examining said list of returned word string results for occurrences wherein any two said returned word string results have overlapping said first and second portions; combining all of said two overlapping returned word strings into third word strings, wherein said third word strings are a combination of said first word strings and said second word strings, merging said overlapped words; and adding all said third word strings to said list of said word string results.

In a similar language processing method used for translations, Tominaga discloses examining a list of word string (sentences) for occurrences wherein any two word strings have overlapping first and second portions; combining all of the two overlapping returned word strings into third word strings, wherein said third word strings are a combination of the first word strings and the second word strings, merging the overlapped words(col. 14, lines 42-61; Fig. 14 and related text); and adding all the third

word strings to a list (sentence file, Fig. 2, element 1 and related text) of said word string results.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to generate new translation candidates by combining word strings with overlapping portions in Grefenstette's method in order to "easily perform maintenance of information about co-occurrence relation in dictionary information" (Tominaga, col. 2, lines 30-34).

Claims 35 and 39:

Claims 35 and 39 are similar in scope and content to claim 31 and are rejected with the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 45 – 56 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Claims 57 – 59 are allowed.

11. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art of record, individually or in combination, does not disclose using two different corpus and identifying word strings in a first list as subset of word strings in a second list as claimed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel G. Neway whose telephone number is 571-270-1058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30AM - 5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/659,792
Art Unit: 2626

Page 11

/S. G. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626